

FILED

FEB 17 2009

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CABN 44332)
United States Attorney

2 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CABN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

3 OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104)
Assistant United States Attorneys

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7241
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
owen.martikan@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, } CR 09-0034 SI
14 Plaintiff, }
15 v. } STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
16 } ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
17 MICHAEL DOUGLAS CARLIN, }
18 Defendant. }

On February 10, 2009, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status conference. The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from February 10, 2009, through February 27, 2009, for effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best

//

STIP. & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
CASE NO. CR 09-0034 SI

1 interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

2 SO STIPULATED:

3 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

4 /s/
5 DATED: _____

6 OWEN P. MARTIKAN
Assistant United States Attorney

7 DATED: _____
8

/s/
9 JODI LINKER
Attorney for Michael Carlin

10

11 [PROPOSED] ORDER

12 As the Court found on February 10, 2009, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion
13 of time from February 10, 2009, through February 27, 2009, is warranted because the ends of
14 justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a
15 speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance
16 would deny defense counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into
17 account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. *See* 18 U.S.C.
18 §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

19

20 SO ORDERED.

21

22 DATED: 2-17-09

23

24

25

26

27

28

HON. MARIA-ELENA JAMES
United States Magistrate Judge

